REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending.

Claims 1-6 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Singhal (US Patent No. 6,938,022).

Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki (US Patent No. 6,253,218) in view of Tanner (US Publication no. 2004/0243588).

The independent claims are 1, 10 and 17.

The Office Action rejects the language of independent claim 1, "*a target dataset containing non-unique persons anonymous data ..., the target datasetnon-unique persons data containing records forof non-uniquely identified persons not related to each other and having similar data*, each record including aone or more of a target name, a target age, anda target age-date indicating an exact or approximate date of the target age, a target current and/or previous address, or target phone listings," by relying upon Singhal's anonymous identifier 320 in the anonymous identifier database 38A and column 6, lines 35-55. However, Singhal's anonymous identifier 320 is a created identifier so the customer can gain access to an information system anonymously (column 3, lines 19-32). In Singhal, a customer's anonymous identifier 320 is pre-associated with the private information of the customer (column 6, lines 45-67). However, the language of claim 1 requires "*a target dataset containing non-unique persons anonymous data ... excluding the private source dataset*, the target datasetnon-unique persons data containing records forof non-uniquely identified persons not related to each other and having similar data, each record including aone or more of a target name, a target age, anda target age-date indicating an exact or approximate date of the target age, a target current and/or previous address, or target phone listings." In other words, the claimed target data set excludes the private source dataset, which differs from Singhal's anonymous customer identifiers database, which is pre-associated with the customer private information database.

Further, the language of claim 1 requires the limitation "***non-unique persons data** containing records forof **non-uniquely identified persons not related to each other and having similar data**,*" which differs from an anonymous identifier of a customer being unique to the customer. The patent application's discussions of persons in the at-large population (for example, paragraphs 21 and 25 of the patent application) support the claims. See also original claim 10. In other words, although Singhal's anonymity is in relation to the information system to

7

be accessed by the customer using the anonymous identifier, Singhal's anonymous identifier 38A is unique in relation to the customer database 38. Accordingly, Singhal's anonymous identifier database 38A cannot expressly or inherently correspond to the claimed "***a target dataset containing <ins>non-unique persons</ins> ~~anonymous~~ data … excluding the <ins>private</ins> source dataset, the ~~target dataset~~<ins>non-unique persons data</ins> containing records ~~for~~<ins>of</ins> non-uniquely identified persons <ins>not related to each other and having similar data</ins>***."

Further, the language of claim 1 is amended to clarify that "***for a particular source person in the source dataset, … automatically determining <ins>by a multi-stage matching and/or elimination process</ins> whether the particular source person corresponds to a particular target person in the target dataset*** and delivering the determination."

For example, the present application paragraphs 21, 23 and 25-26 support the claims.

A benefit of the invention is to link disparate data fragments, namely determining for an application whether there is a link between a uniquely identified person and non-uniquely identified persons. A prima facie case of anticipation based upon Singhal cannot be established, because as discussed, Singhal fails to disclose expressly, or inherently by failing to necessarily require, each element of the language of claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and allowance of claim 1 is requested.

Claims 10 and 17 are amended to require limitations similar to the discussed limitations of amended claim 1.

Dependent claims recite patentably distinguishing features of their own or are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from the independent claims.

Withdrawal of the rejections of pending claims and allowance of the claims is requested.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: March 30, 2009   By: _____

                                    Mehdi D. Sheikerz
                                    Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501